Fixing Our Eyes On Jesus, Our High Priest

Hebrews 2:10-13 Rev. Jeff Stivason March 30, 2018

Jeff: Our heavenly Father, we are thankful for this day. We're thankful for the Lord and for the greatness of salvation that is in Him. Father, we are thankful for our fellowship. And we recognize that that fellowship takes place on a number of levels. It takes place in our sharing with one another the burden of the ministry. But it also has to do with our relationship one to another and our ability even to have fun with one another like we had this morning. Father, we are thankful for every level of that friendship and every spectrum from one end to the other.

And we're thankful for today and for this group. And Lord, as we gather together, we pray that you would make us mindful of the common denominator between us, which is the Lord Jesus. Lord, as we open Your word this morning, we ask that You will continue to illuminate it to our eyes. We pray that You will bring it to bear upon our lives in such a way that it strengthens our whole being, that we might grow in the likeness of the Lord Jesus Christ, looking for the day of consummation when we will be fully and finally renewed in Him. Lord, we ask that You will do this for Your glory and certainly for our well-being. Lord, we ask it in Jesus' name. Amen.

Men: Amen.

Jeff: All right. Well, let's look at Hebrews chapter 2 and verses 10-13 this morning. Does somebody want to read that this morning who has a nice, strong, loud voice? Of course, maybe I'm the amplified voice, so I should read it.

Participant: I can read that, Jeff.

Jeff: Go ahead, Ted.

Ted: "For it was fitting that He, for whom and by whom all things exist, in bringing many sons to glory, should make the Founder of their salvation perfect through suffering. For He who sanctifies and those who are sanctified all have one source. That is why He is not ashamed to call them brothers, saying,

'I will tell of Your name to My brothers;

In the midst of the congregation I will sing Your praise.'

"And again, 'I will put My trust in Him.' And again, 'Behold, I and the children God has given Me.'" This is the word of the Lord.

Men: Thanks be to God.

Jeff: Okay. Well this morning we're going to look at four aspects of this text. We're going to do a brief introduction to get our bearings. Then we're going to look at three very interconnected points—*God's purpose, God's Man* and *God's people*. And you'll see how those relate and intersect as we go along.

Now let me just say this. I know that no matter where you are I've learned that there is a Civil War buff in our midst. Is that true here? Yes? All right. So I'm going to throw a date up on the board.

Transcriber's Note: April 15, 1865.

Jeff: Nobody raised his hand. So nobody is putting himself out, you know, as the guy. But if you know it, you can shout out what it is. What happened on that date? Does anybody know?

Participant: Appomattox.

Jeff: April 15, 1865. I heard Abraham Lincoln, but—

Participant: He died.

Second Participant: Was that Appomattox? **Jeff:** It was the assassination of Lincoln.

Participant: On Good Friday. **Jeff:** Yes, on Good Friday. **Participant:** Oh really? Wow!

Jeff: I don't know if it was Good Friday at that time or not.

Participant: Wow! How about that!

Jeff: So Abraham Lincoln is assassinated. About that time, several months later, a guy by the name of Walt Whitman writes a poem called "O Captain, My Captain." Some of you probably know it. I went to school at a time when we didn't memorize poetry. That was a late date. Maybe some of you have memorized that. Would anybody like to stand up and recite it? (*Laughter*) But some of the lines of the poem go something like this.

"The ship was weathered, every raft.

The prize we sought is won.

For you they call the swaying mast,

Their eager faces turning."

You know, what Whitman was doing was that he was trying to symbolize the country in terms of a ship. And the ship had come home in victory. And the masses had greeted the ship and were calling for their captain.

But the trouble was that the captain gave no response. And there was a reason why he gave no response.

"My captain does not answer;

His lips are pale and still.

My father does not feel my arm;

He has no pulse or will."

It was quite a moving poem for the country that was trying to put a finger on the pulse of their grief at that time. But what strikes me about this particular poem and its place in American history with this kind of thing, with Lincoln addressed as a captain, is something that you may be saying. What in the world does this poem have to do with our text?

And it's this. In Hebrews chapter 2 verse 10 we find that Jesus is called "the Author of our salvation."

Now when you think about the Greek language and any language for that matter, one of the things that you have to realize is that there is a range of meanings. When you translate a text, you can't just find one word that does everything for every other word. So you can't find a word that translates the word for—I'm distracted. Am I too loud or too—

Participant: No.

Jeff: All right. I feel like I'm too loud.

Participant: No.

Jeff: All right. So you can't just grab a word and say that we're always going to use this word to translate this other word.

Well that's the idea here. The word *author* can mean various things. In some places it's translated *leader*. In some places this same word *archaegos* is translated *pioneer*. In other places it's *originator*. In some places it's *founder*.

But if you look in the King James Version in our text and in Acts chapter 2, one of the things that you'll find is that it's translated *Captain*. *Archaegos* means that He's the Captain of our salvation. He's the Pioneer, the Originator, He's the Founder. He is all of these things. So all of these things in some way, shape or form provide a nuance to the word *archaegos* that the other word doesn't provide. And yet, He is our Captain.

Now there are many differences between Abraham Lincoln and Jesus Christ, and you know that. But there's an interesting difference when I think about this text and what the word *archaegos* means, and how it relates to Abraham Lincoln. Captain Lincoln was "pale and still." But if you look at Acts 3:14, it says that they put to death "the Prince of life."

Now that's interesting to me because when I look at that word in Greek it's the word *archaegos*. They put to death the Captain of life.

Now when you think about that, that in and of itself, that statement alone, is an amazing statement! How do you put to death the Founder, the Originator, the Captain of life? And yet they did.

And so one of the things that you find in a striking similarity is that the Captain lies still in the ground. They put to death "the Prince of life."

But death held Lincoln. He's not around today. The great dissimilarity is that death could not hold the Captain of life. and there were many reasons for that. But chief among them is that the Captain of life is the Captain of life because He is the embodiment of righteousness. And it would be utterly unjust for the God of heaven and earth to leave the Captain of life, who is the just Man, in the grave. And so death couldn't hold Him, as Acts chapter 2 says. And He was raised to newness of life. He was raised to life.

And so this is the great dissimilarity. And yet we're thinking together today about the Captain of life, not the captain who lay still with his lips pale.

Today we're looking at the Lord Jesus Christ. But today we're looking at a text that says some things about this Captain of life, our Captain of life, that could be a bit perplexing to us. And I want to pursue those things with you today.

But first of all, before we pursue those things, we need to look at *God's purpose in sending the Captain of life*. And look at the text just for a minute. It says in verse 10, "For it was fitting that He, for whom and by whom all things exist, in bringing many sons to glory, should make the Founder of their salvation perfect through suffering."

It was fitting, suitable, even a requirement that God should make the Captain of our salvation perfect, and that through suffering. Now I don't know about you, but that's the kind of statement that causes a person to be perplexed, because typically, when we think

about Jesus Christ, we don't think about Jesus in need of any perfection. And yet it says that the purpose of God was to make the Captain of life fitting for our salvation.

So what does that mean? Well, this is what it means. It means just what we've been saying. It means that God had to make this One fitting for our salvation. Now if we just look at it from that perspective alone we say, okay. We understand that God made Christ to be the Savior of mankind, the Captain of our salvation, to be the Savior of our life. And so this fittedness includes the Son of God, and so we don't get around that question. How did He do this and why did He have to do this? And what does this mean for us, especially when we think about Christ as the perfect One?

Well, what does all that mean? It leads us—and predominantly so this morning—it leads us to think about *God's Man*, the One who was fitted for salvation. So let's do some of that thinking this morning.

And there are a few questions that we're going to answer when we think about this particular text. We're going to think first of all about *His identity*. We're going to think about the Man's identity.

You're going to say to me, "Oh, we already know who He is. This is Jesus." But I want to think a little deeper about who He is.

And the second thing we're going to think about is this. What does it mean that He was made fitting for our salvation? What does it mean that He was made fitting—in other words, made perfect—through suffering for our salvation? What does that mean? Why does the Scripture say that?

Well, let me say two things. First of all, *the identity of the Captain of our salvation*. You say that we already know this. Jesus is God. We are an orthodox group of men sitting here. We've been taught well. We know that this is God. Jesus is God, the second Person of the Trinity. I understand that. But I think it's important that we see it from the text. How is it that we know this from the text, so that when somebody says—for instance, the Jehovah's Witness that comes knocking at the door—"Yes. I know what you say. You say that Jesus is God. But the text says that He was made perfect. And how is it that a God who is supposed to be perfect is made perfect?" And so what does the text say? How does it indicate that Jesus is God?

Well, there's a basic principle that we have to keep in mind, and it's *opera ad extra Trinitatus indivisa sunt. (Laughter)* That's a basic principle, and it means that *the external works of the Trinity are indivisible*, which simply means that we ascribe creation to God the Father. We ascribe the atonement to the Son. We ascribe the application of the work of Christ to the Holy Spirit. We do all these things.

But we also understand that when the Father creates, the Spirit hovers. We understand that it was through the Son that the creation happened. We also understand what? We understand that "the Lord is the Spirit." I think it says that in 2 Corinthians 3:17, where we find that Jesus almost seems to be sort of equated with the Spirit. "The Lord is the Spirit."

What does that mean? Well, I'll tell you what it means. At the very least it means that the Son's work and the Spirit's work are so interwoven that Paul can talk about the Lord being the Spirit in terms of the Spirit's application of the Son's work. It doesn't mean that

They're the same Person, because They're not. It means that Their purpose and Their aim is so one that They can be talked about in such a way that when they act they seem to be acting together, and in accord with one another. And that's the principle.

But there's another principle and it's a balancing principle, and it's *the principle of appropriation*. Go ahead.

Participant: You said that They seem to be working together. Do They seem to be working together, or are They working together?

Jeff: Well They *are* working together, but They seem to be working together. (*Laughter*)

Participant: I asked because he said that They seem to be working together. And I said, "Are They working together, or do They seem to be working together," which would imply the possibility of Them not working together.

Jeff: Yes. And think about *the doctrine of appropriation*. The doctrine of appropriation says, but wait a minute! The Person of the Father does not die upon the cross, right? So there is a sense in which in purpose and in aim and in commitment externally, according to the covenant, They are working in one accord together. And yet in the seemingness of it, we have to make distinctions and we have to say, well, yes. But it is not the case that the Father dies on the cross. The Person of the Son as Mediator dies. And so there's a sense in which this principle balances the other. Okay, does that make sense?

Participant: No.

Jeff: No. (Laughter) All right, tell me. Where are you struggling?

Participant: I think that some of you may be sitting here thinking, "Gosh, this is so obscure! Why in the heck are we dealing with this? How does this help me pay my bills or treat my wife better?" And the thing is that if you don't make these distinctions, the heretics will make these distinctions.

Jeff: Yeah, right.

Participant: The heretics will tell you what the truth is. They'll end up being contrary to what the truth is because you'll not make the distinctions. You'll just say, "Give it to me simple, brother."

Jeff: Yes. And so what you have is that you have a heresy arising in the early church called *patripatianism*, which says, at least in part, that it was the Father who died on the cross. And so you're right. If you don't make these kinds of distinctions,-- I mean, what we all want to affirm is here's what we want to stay away from. Here, practically speaking, is where the rubber meets the road at one point.

And this is alive and well in the Christian church. In the Christian church there are those who believe, even if they don't articulate it this way, there are those who believe that the Son reconciled us to a Father who didn't really and who doesn't really want us. And they forget Romans 5, which says that God sent His Son "when we were yet sinners." They forget that part of it.

But in our thinking here's the kind of thing we do. We say, "Well I know I'm reconciled in Jesus Christ. And I know Jesus loves me. The pastor keeps telling me that Jesus loves me. He must love me. But I also know that every time things seem to be going good for me, I feel like I get a good crack on the head. So what does that mean?

And every time I draw near to God and the Son brings me near to God, and the Father's going, 'Oh come here, come on!', and then I get close to Him, He trounces me on the head." And that is the way that a good many Christians feel.

And the doctrine of *ad extra Trinitatus indivisa sunt* puts the kibosh on that when it says, no, no, no, no, no. It's not just the Son who loved you when you were yet a sinner. But it's the Father who loved you when you were yet a sinner. It's the Holy Spirit who loved you when you were yet a sinner. And they worked in concert to bring you to saving faith in Christ. So you are brought through Christ, but you are brought by every Person of the Trinity to every Person of the triune God. Does that make sense?

And yet we have to say that we understand that it happens in concert. But we also understand that there are some aspects of our being brought near to the triune God that are given to some Persons of the Trinity and not others. So it is given to the Son to atone for our sins on the cross. It's not given to the Holy Spirit to atone for our sins on the cross, and so on. Yes?

Participant: I was going to make a comment, and it's probably a little bit past. But if you look at the Trinity and the different roles that each One plays, you can look at a husband and wife. There's a lot of different kinds of interplay where you can make this application. I'm an employee and an employer. There are all these different roles that we play. And we have to know how they all work. And they do work together, but they're similar and different at the same time. (*Unclear*)

Jeff: Well let me show you where this—

Participant: But what he said, is that not a heresy?

Jeff: Well, in terms of its application it's a good application. In terms of applying it to the Trinity, it is *modalism*.

Participant: Yes.

Jeff: So, for instance, this is Sig over here. So in terms of explaining the Trinity, in terms of me being a son, a father and a husband, that's modalism. Why? Because I'm one person in three different roles. So that would be like saying that the Father in the Old Testament is the Father. But He changes His clothes and becomes the Son in the Gospels. And then in the book of Acts at Pentecost He changes His clothes again and becomes the Holy Spirit, and now He is the Holy Spirit in the church age. That is modalism and that would be a heresy.

So in terms of your application I understand it, but not in terms of your actual understanding. So, for instance, if you're trying to explain the Trinity to your children, it's probably best not to use any analogies. Why?

Let's think about this for a minute. Why is an egg not a good analogy?

Participant: It's one egg.

Jeff: You've got three parts and they're distinct. What's the matter with that?

Participant: They're not one.

Jeff: They're not one.

Participant: And the yoke isn't all egg.

Jeff: And the yoke isn't all egg. Right. So there are ways of understanding the Trinity that are not right. The Trinity is best affirmed by saying that there is one God. There are three Persons in the one God. And all three are God.

Participant: Right.

Jeff: And I realize that's propositional. And it doesn't lend itself to analogy. But that's probably the best way to teach it. Go ahead.

Participant: Pastor Jeff, speaking to the identity—and this might not be the right time to ask the question—

Jeff: Okay, go ahead.

Participant: But when Christ said, "Father, Father, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" did God leave Him?

Jeff: As to His mediation He did. But as to His nature He did not.

Participant: Wow!

Jeff: So as Mediator He was forsaken. But as to who He was and is, as to His nature, His ontological being, God did not leave Him.

Participant: Thank you.

Jeff: That was a great question. Now you guys sometimes get on me for talking deep. (*Laughter*) Over here.

Participant: Well I was going to go back to something.

Jeff: Yes, go ahead.

Participant: You were talking over here. I've heard people equate the Father, Son and Holy Ghost as water—solid, liquid, gas, all the same thing in different forms.

Jeff: Yes, right.

Participant: That would be less, but still the same?

Jeff: That would be a form of modalism, because it's one substance of water just taking three different forms at three different times. I think the bishop was next.

Bishop Rodgers: It might be helpful if people realize one thing. And that is that what we've been talking about are the works of God *ad extra*, into our world. But in His own life He is constituted so that the Father is the Father, the Son is the Son and the Spirit is the Spirit. They each are distinct in what They do, and that's eternally true.

Jeff: Yes.

Bishop Rodgers: And so it's only when He steps out of who He is into relationship with us in the world that this correlation takes place.

Jeff: Yes, it's like what the bishop says. Think about prior to creation. Think about the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit prior to creation. The Father is the Father distinctly prior to creation. And He has a relationship to the other two Persons of the Trinity as They are distinctly who They are in relationship to Him and to each other. And that's prior to creation.

It is after the work of creation, or in the work of creating, that we begin to find Them having this covenantal purpose. There's no covenant in the Trinity prior to creation. But at creation, at the moment of creation, there is a covenant, where They all agree to work together and take on these different works according to the execution of that covenant. Sig, was there somebody else?

Participant: Well, They loved each other before creation.

Jeff: Absolutely.

Participant: They were one.

Jeff: Yes, that's right. And that's why when we talk about the immutability or the unchangeableness of God, what we're not saying is that there wasn't a dynamic relationship, a love relationship between Them, because there certainly was. But who They are in that relationship is unchanging. But They have a relationship prior to creation amongst Themselves. That's very important and vital to affirm.

Participant: I want to say that I think we see reflections of the Trinity in the threes where God reveals Himself in that way. But because He is above nature there is no way that anything in nature could reflect Him as an adequate analogy.

Jeff: Yes, although, you know, it depends on the theologian you read. Jonathan Edwards thought that everything could be brought down to rationality. I think I heard John Gerstner say one time that he thought that Jonathan Edwards could have deduced the Trinity from nature. I don't know how he could have done that. But that's what he—

Participant: But let's say that he could deduce it from nature.

Jeff: But I don't know if you could deduce it the way that it's proposed. Like you're saying, there are threes. But I don't know if you could deduce it in the way that the Bible puts it forward. You know what I mean? The Bible puts it forward in a way that it doesn't seem to have a natural analogy to any part in nature. There are some hints to it. I mean, there's a hint in the three-leaf clover and those kinds of things. But they just don't seem to match up. All right. Anything else? Yes?

Participant: You know, part of our true worship of Him is to realize that no matter how smart you are, this is way above us.

Jeff: Yes, right. This is above the pay grade, right? It surely is. And you know, the great thing about this is, and I think that the wonderful thing about the church is that when you look at the church, they're only concerned about these things when heretics start saying, "Yes, but this is this, that or the other." And then the church has to say, "Okay. Let's sit down and think about this. And what do we affirm from the Scriptures?" And they have to begin with precision.

You know, using the Apostles' Creed for instance, the Apostles' Creed was very basic. It was called the Roman Symbol in the 2nd century. It was very basic. And we all think about it as a universal creed. But it's really not a universal creed. It was a creed that was used to fight a group of heretics called the Gnostics.

And part of their heresy was that they denied the reality of substance. So terms like *body* were added to the creed, and things that affirmed Christ in His bodily nature. Those were added. Or "*Creator of heaven and earth*." "Heaven and earth" was added. Why? Because the Gnostics didn't believe that Jesus would have anything to do with the Father who created matter.

So there are specific issues that arise in the church. And the church is forced then to deal with them. And it usually takes on a more academic sort of thinking that says, all right. We've got to meet this challenge, you know? Okay?

All right. So let's think about how it is that our text portrays the union of purpose between these Persons. Hebrews 2:11. "Both He who sanctifies and those who are sanctified" are all from one Father.

Now when you think about who it is that sanctifies, you think about that as being a work of the Holy Spirit. But it is here given to the Son. It's in 2:10. Who is bringing sons to glory? It's the Son.

You know, I probably should not hurry through this. So in other words, when you think about who the Sanctifier is, you typically think about the Holy Spirit. And yet our text seems to indicate that it's Jesus who sanctifies. So when we think about each Person of the Trinity having an appropriate function, as They have all one aim and purpose, we typically think because the Scriptures predominantly portray the work of sanctification as the work of the Holy Spirit.

But here in our text we find that it is Jesus who is the One who sanctifies. So what I'm saying to you is that there is, in the work of the Trinity, a common union of purpose that is shared by each One, such that though it might be appropriate for the Spirit to sanctify, we can say without reservation that it is the Son who sanctifies.

Look at Hebrews 2:10. Who is bringing sons to glory?

Participant: It seems like it's the Father.

Jeff: It seems like it's the Father, doesn't it? Is it the Father? Sure it is. But look at this. Hebrews 2:13. The Son calls the redeemed His children. We typically think about the Father as what? The Father. And we are His what? His sons and daughters, as He has brought us to Himself in glory.

But here the Son calls us His children. I typically think of what we'll read later in our text. I typically think of Jesus as my Brother. But here He is referred to as our Father by implication, okay?

So the triune God has one mind concerning our redemption in the divine Son. And although there are even these appropriate things attributed to each one of them, it is very appropriate for us to talk about any one of them in terms of the other.

We can say, for instance, that God the Father accomplished our salvation. And we would work that out. That's a true statement. He did accomplish our salvation. So those things are important to keep in mind. But before we go on not to the identity of the Son, but going on to thinking about how it was that He was made perfect, let's stop and ask if there are any questions at this point. Yes, Don?

Don: At the risk of opening up a can of worms, in verse 9 it says that He "tasted death for everyone." For those of us who believe in limited atonement, is it proper to understand verse 10 as everyone referring to the sons He is bringing to glory?

Jeff: Yes. Well Don, I didn't even mention that because that's kind of where we all are on this. (*Laughter*) I mean, how can you live under Bruce Bickel as long as you have, (*laughter*), and not know that the *everyone* there is the everyone He brought to glory? You know, I'll just say it, Don. Forgive me for making those kinds of assumptions there, buddy! (*Laughter*) If you do have questions about that, I'll be glad to take them.

Participant: I think that's appropriate because although we all sit under Bruce Bickel, not all of us sit under pastors who teach that.

Jeff: Yes, that's true.

Participant: They say that when it says *all*, it refers to all of humanity, and in a sense it's an invitation to everyone to come forward, if they will.

Jeff: Yes, if they so will, despite the fact that they are unable to do so. (Laughter) Because I did not lose my ability to will in Adam, I can still will to do things. Look, I just willed to set that controller down and I willed to take it up again. My will is not broken. I can will. The thing that I cannot will, as I lay dead in Adam, is God. He has to resurrect my desires such that I want God, because it's just as Romans 3:23 says. "All have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God." And like it says before that, "There is no one righteous." No one seeks God. And they don't seek God because they don't desire Him. They desire to suppress everything that He reveals about Himself in unrighteousness.

So though my will is not broken, my desires are not toward Him. And they have to be made so by a resurrection—Ephesians 2:4.

Transcriber's Note: Ephesians 2:4-5. "But God, being rich in mercy, because of the great love with which He loved us, even when we were dead in our trespasses, made us alive together with Christ."

Jeff: God made me alive in Christ Jesus.

So there's an improperness to saying that God loves the world without making some qualification to it. In other words, how is it that God loves the world? He loves the world in that the farmer has crops that grow, right?—despite the fact that he's an unbeliever. And we call that *God's love of benevolence*. In other words, He's good to His creation and to those He has created.

But His saving love only comes to rest upon those He has saved in Christ. And we call that His *love of complacency*. The word *complacent* is not a great word to use. But it means *a settledness*. If you're complacent, you're settled on the couch, right? Well, His love is settled upon us in Jesus Christ. It's that love of complacency. So there are nuances one has to make in terms of talking about God's love for the world. Yes?

Participant: I totally support and agree with what Scripture teaches in regard to election and as far as election is concerned. But from a human standpoint, we're in a sense given hope that God's work or Christ's work is sufficient. We go out to all the world proclaiming that truth with the hope that they will repent and believe. And the reason I say it this way is that I don't necessarily see election in this context. If this were the only passage I ever read, I wouldn't see that. But I would see the power of Christ as sufficient to save all men. And I would be encouraged as a believer to take that truth to the world.

Jeff: Right. But what you do see in this passage is what Don mentioned, right? "For it was fitting that He, for whom and by whom all things exist, in bringing many sons to glory, should make the Founder of their salvation perfect." The idea of Him bringing many sons to glory is certainly there in the text. And even if you only had this particular text, you would still have a divine initiative in it.

Participant: Okay.

Jeff: Do you see that?

Participant: Yes, I see it.

Jeff: Anybody else?

Participant: As Anglicans, every time we celebrate the Lord's Supper, we read in our celebration 1 John 2:2. "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world."

Jeff: Yes.

Participant: How would you interpret that?

Jeff: Yes, that's a good one. *(Laughter)* So let me just also take you to John chapter 3. So when you think about the concentric circles of interpretation, you think about interpreting it in light of the book, and then in light of other books written by that same author, and then you think about it in light of the New Testament, right? So we're thinking about this statement in light of another book written by the same author.

Also think of it this way. What does *propitiation* mean? Theologically, what does *propitiation* mean? When we say *propitiation*, what do we mean?

Participant: God is dealing with His own justice.

Jeff: Right. He is dealing with the wrath upon us in His Son Jesus Christ, right? He is removing the wrath because He has dealt with it in Jesus Christ.

Now in John 3:36 it says, "Whoever believes in the Son has eternal life; whoever does not obey the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God remains on him."

So there's a sense in which when we look at 1 John 2:2, that it says "the propitiation for the whole world." And yet this text says that God's wrath remains on the one who doesn't believe. And it seems to be a bit of a tension, doesn't it? Which is why I would then argue that the *world* there does not mean every individual in the world, but that it means those that Christ saves out of the world, from every tribe and nation and tongue and language. So there's a sense in which we say that God has made propitiation for all those who belong to Him in the whole world, and that wrath does not remain on them. Go ahead, Don.

Don: Not only that, but you have the same author in 1 John 5, which says that "we are of God, and the whole world is in the power of the evil one." If you take the whole world to be each and every person, then we're in a whole heap of trouble. The whole world means those outside of Christ.

Participant: So to the point you're making, and to the question that the young man made over here, the question about faith and witnessing, part of the problem—and I sometimes find it a lot in our circles—is that we deal with God's business like we're God. And the point is that we don't know the sheep and the goats.

Jeff: Mm-hmm.

Participant: And I find that sometimes people believe too much in being in God's business. They don't witness because they think that they become fruit inspectors. And if you don't tie your shoes like I do, you're not chosen. So the point is, just share the Word. You don't know who's who.

Jeff: That's what Paul says. Remember in 1 Timothy—I think it's 5—where he says, "I endure everything for the sake of the elect."

Participant: Right, that's right.

Jeff: So he combines the idea of preaching the gospel to the whole world, because he doesn't know who the elect are. But he knows there are the elect, and he knows that the elect will respond when he preaches. And that verse has always been a huge help to me in that regard. Okay.

Participant: Some of us are four point Calvinists.

Jeff: Oh, I got you! (Laughter)

Participant: There is no such thing! (Laughter)

Jeff: We'll put you and Don together.

Participant: Such an animal does not exist. (Laughter)

Jeff: Anybody else? All right. So our Captain was made fitting. Was our Captain imperfect?

Participant: No.

Jeff: Of course not. No, He wasn't. So think about this syllogism. God is perfect. Jesus is God. Therefore Jesus is perfect. Not hard; straightforward.

So what does it mean that He has been made "perfect through suffering?" Well, the idiom is to fill the hands. And it's an idiom that actually goes back to the Old Testament.

For instance, in Exodus 29:33 and Leviticus 21:10 it describes the priestly consecration.

Transcriber's Note: Exodus 29:33. "They shall eat those things with which the atonement was made, to consecrate and to sanctify them; but an outsider shall not eat them, because they are holy."

Leviticus 21:10. "The priest who is chief among his brothers, on whose head the anointing oil is poured, and who has been consecrated to wear the garments, shall not let the hair of his head hang loose, nor tear his clothes."

Jeff: Used in that context it describes the priestly consecration. In other words, the priests are fitted out for their due duties.

We're not going to say much about this now. But I realize that may raise questions. But I think it answers a bunch. And that is that Jesus Christ comes as Mediator, to fulfill the whole Law in order to become our sacrifice who is without spot or blemish, and then has to take upon Himself the curse for us. So there's a sense in which He is fitted out for it in His humiliation, that He might accomplish it on the cross. So there's sort of this idea of Him, that His whole life fills His hand, that He might be prepared for the task upon the cross that He's given. So Jesus was fitted out through suffering to be our perfect Sacrifice.

Now I'm going to short circuit us and just run through this last part, which is not hard at all. There are some verses here that are really interesting to look at. Psalm 22 is here and it speaks of Jesus. Psalm 22 speaks of Jesus' sufferings and His humiliation. But here we find it used with reference to His glory.

And so He's standing here in the midst of His people, right? The other two verses are from Isaiah 8. He says, "*Trust in the LORD*," and He stands in the midst of the congregation. And He encourages His brothers as He leads them in singing.

I'll just say this to you. What a wonderful thing it is to think about Jesus leading us in our worship. We typically think about our presenter or our worship leader leading us in

worship. But it's not! It is the Lord Jesus Christ who stands in the midst of us and leads us in worship. And it's just an amazing thing to think about when you think about it like that.

And so let me just hasten on to this. It's a reality check. The reality check is that *Christ is present in our worship*. And so the question I want to leave you with is this. If Christ is present with us in our worship, where would you rather be? Would you rather be anywhere else than where your Brother, the One who brought you to the Father, is standing, encouraging you to trust in the Father? If you'd rather be anywhere else than with Him in worship, you have to ask yourself a question. Where am I in my thinking about the Lord Jesus Christ? Where am I?

And Ted's right. We talk about how does this help me live with my wife, or how does this help me at my workplace? I want to tell you something. If you know why it is that you worship God, that will go a long way to helping you understand why it is that you act in a certain way toward your wife, or being a certain kind of employee, right? If you know why it is that you stand before the living God and how you are able to stand before the living God, then that's foundational for a life well lived. But it's more than that. It's foundational for salvation. I'm going to wrap us up there. Go ahead.

Participant: I wonder if I can tie in the very first thing you said with the very last thing. You started off with the translation of the word *Author*. And the word in Greek is—

Jeff: Archaegos.

Participant: Archaegos. Does that not mean chief, or primary leader?

Jeff: Yes.

Participant: It consists in two Greek words—*archae*, which means *the beginning* or *the primeval*, or *the very foundation*, and *aego*, which is *to lead*. So He's the chief Leader, and now He becomes the chief Leader of all worship.

Jeff: Yes. That's great. That's really great. Nice. (Laughter) Anybody else?

Let me pray for us then. Father in heaven, thanks for the day and for the time You've given. Lord, bless us now as we go out into the world. Lord, we know that we need your help. And we know that we need Your enablement. We pray that You will bless us and continue to sanctify us by Your grace in the Lord Jesus Christ. And Lord, we pray that You will help us to look forward to the Lord's Day, that we might stand with our elder Brother, and be encouraged to place our trust in You, our heavenly Father. Do this, Father, as You enable us by Your Spirit to do so, for we ask it in Jesus' name. Amen.

Men: Amen. (Applause)